

Misenyova V. V.,*Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Foreign Languages № 2
Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University***Spilnyk T. M.,***Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Philology, Translation and Strategic Communication
National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine*

PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS WITH NO DIRECT EQUIVALENTS IN THE ASPECT OF INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Summary. The theoretical information of intercultural communication research has been systematized and the analysis of such areas as comparative culturology, translation theory, foreign language teaching, contrastive pragmatics, etc. have been carried out in the article.

In the course of the research, the authors examine a number of questions, namely: what is the national character, and what can be considered a source that would provide true information about the national character. The features of the personality are reflected in its language in general, and phraseological units with no direct equivalents in particular. Phraseological units, reflecting in their semantics the long process of development of the people's culture, record and transmit from generation to generation cultural concepts, stereotypes, symbols, standards, mythologies, and so on.

The authors analyze the connection of phraseological units with the mentality of the people, study what characteristic features of culture are reflected in the national character.

It has been found that in recent years linguists have increasingly focused on the study of translation as a cultural phenomenon. Different languages are able to reflect the specific features of culture. However, not all the elements of the fund of one language group can take place in the cultural fund of another. When translating, this feature complicates the transfer of cultural specificity of one language by means of another.

Despite the fact that some fragments of reality in different languages coincide, the methods of their nomination may differ significantly. For example, in Russian and English there is a group of units denoting food and drink. However, the method of nomination in English differs in the use of units with the word *tea* (чай): *high tea* (ранний ужин с чаем), *husband's tea* (очень слабый чай), *a cup that cheers but not inebriates* (напиток веселящий, но не пьянящий), which are absent in the Russian language. This feature is due primarily to the uniqueness of the culture and way of life of the British, who differ from other nations by their passion to tea.

Important is the fact that knowledge of the rules of conduct and customs of one culture does not give a representative of other culture complete information about its linguistic picture.

The proposed observations allow us to identify the following aspects of the study of intercultural communication: macroculture – translation – the degree of equivalence, taking into account national and cultural factors.

Key words: comparative analysis, equivalence, national-cultural component, semantics, symbol, phrasemes with no direct equivalents.

Introduction. In various scientific paradigms you can find a large number of definitions of the language, but they all come down to one thing: language is a means of expressing thoughts, a means of communication. Undoubtedly, without language any form of communication between people becomes impossible. Language serves as the communication medium, and communication and communication are the most essential part of human life and a part of culture. The close interrelationship of language and culture was indicated by many linguists [2; 3; 4; 7; 9; 12; 13]. According to K. Levy-Strauss, language is both a product of culture, and its important constituent component, and a condition for the existence of culture. Moreover, language is a mode of cultural existence, as well as a factor of formation of cultural codes [9, p. 28]. S. G. Ter-Minasova gives a definition of the language in which a cultural component is its integral property: "Language is a powerful social tool forming a human flow into an ethnos, generating a nation through the storage and transmission of culture, traditions, and social identity of this speech collective [13, p. 15]. Language is not only closely linked with culture, but it "grows from it and expresses it" [9, c. 28].

Linguoculturology is a branch of language science directly related to the study of culture. It has recently gained ground among academics, as evidenced by numerous scientific studies in this direction [1; 4; 9; 10; 12]. According to professor V.V. Vorobyov, who develops the concept of E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov, linguoculturology is a scientific discipline that studies "the interconnection and interaction of culture and language in its functioning and reflects this process as an holistic structure of units in their unity of their linguistic and non-linguistic (cultural) content by means of systemic methods and with an orientation to contemporary priorities and cultural establishments (systems of norms and social values)" [4, p. 125–126]. To our mind, this view is echoed by the opinion of V.A. Maslova, who argues that culturology is a science that studies the material and spiritual culture embodied in a living national language and manifests itself in linguistic processes [9, p. 28]. In addition, linguoculturology explores the living communicative processes of speech generation and perception, the experience of a linguistic personality and national mentality, providing a systematic description of the linguistic picture of the world.

One of the developing areas of linguoculturology is intercultural communication. The definition of this direction is reflected in the term

itself: it is the communication of people representing different cultures [13, 14]. The initial knowledge-building phase on intercultural communication is mainly based on the experience of foreign researchers. The work of American linguists E. Hall and G. Treiger "Culture and Communication. Analysis Model" became fundamental. In this scientific work, intercultural communication refers to the ideal goal to which a person can strive to in his desire to adapt as best as possible and more effectively to the world around him. As a result of numerous studies, the most characteristic features of intercultural communication were identified: belonging of the sender and recipient of the message to different cultures, awareness by communication participants of each other's cultural differences, etc. [18]. A number of western scholars described their own experience in teaching intercultural communication and proposed models for organizing intercultural learning [14; 15; 16; 17].

Thus, intercultural communication has become the subject of the research in a number of works written by Russian scientists [5; 6; 7; 11; 13]. So, E.M. Vereshchagin and V.G. Kostomarov in their scientific work "Language and Culture" study the living communicative processes of speech generation and perception, the experience of the linguistic personality and the national mentality of different cultures [3]. The textbook "Fundamentals of Intercultural Communication" edited by A.P. Sadkhin is the result of cooperation between German and Russian scientists. The book systematically presents the whole range of issues and problems arising in the process of intercultural communication, examines the cultural and anthropological aspect of interaction of different peoples [7]. In a scientific study by M.K. Golovanivskaya, the peculiarities of the French mentality are studied from the perspective of a native speaker of the Russian language [6]. The monograph by S.G. Ter-Minasova "Language and Intercultural Communication" is devoted to the problems of relationships, interconnection, mutual influence and interaction of the language and culture in the process of people's communication [13].

The topicality of the article. Familiarity with the above-mentioned works shows that research on intercultural communication has taken a strong place in linguistics, having gained the status of an independent linguistic direction. However, there are many questions that have not yet been investigated in this aspect. While the general issues of intercultural communication have been studied to a certain extent, the individual levels and systems in this aspect have not yet been examined. At the same time, it is the individual language units that represent the peculiarities of culture, as they accumulate the knowledge and experience of the people in their meaning. The phraseological system of the language in this aspect is of particular interest. One must admit that in the field of intercultural communication it is far from exhaustive. Among the many phraseological units that deserve the attention of linguists, a special place is occupied by the group of phrasemes with no direct equivalents. On the one hand, the indicated phraseological units can be related to lexical units, as in the linguistic picture of the world, like words, they occupy certain places and this can be cultural lacunae. On the other hand, they differ from words by carrying specific features of phrasemes – many of these features may be due to cultural factors. All this indicates that the study of phrases that do not have correspondences in the system of words, in the linguocultural aspect, can give new results.

The purpose of the article is to study phraseological units that do not have correspondences in the word system in the aspect of intercultural communication.

In connection with the goal, it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

1. Find out what features of the linguistic personality are reflected in the semantics of the phraseological units of the studied group, and how the mentality of the people is expressed in it.

2. To determine what causes the national-cultural specificity of the analyzed group of phrasemes.

Before proceeding to the solution of the tasks, let's consider the basic concepts related to the problem of intercultural communication.

Having entered a foreign culture, it is necessary not only to act in accordance with the norms, customs and traditions of this culture, but also to have an idea of the national character, which occupies an important place in each ethnic image. The national character is a totality for representatives of a particular nation of specific physical and spiritual qualities, norms of behavior, activity, etc., and most importantly, "the totality of the most important ways of regulating activities and communication based on the values of the society created by the nation" [7].

In the process of research, the question arises: what is the manifestation of a national character and what can be considered a source that provides real information about the national character? The personality traits are reflected in his/her language and in the use of phraseological units in particular. Phrasemes, reflecting in their semantics the long process of people's culture development, fix and transmit from generation to generation cultural concepts, stereotypes, symbols, standards, mythologem, etc. V.N. Telia writes that the phraseological units of the language is "a mirror in which the linguocultural community identifies its national identity" [12, p. 249]. Joining this point of view, V.A. Maslova draws attention to the fact that phraseological units are always directed at the subject, that is, "they arise not so much to describe the world as to in order to interpret, evaluate and express a subjective attitude to it" [9, p. 82].

Presentation of the main research. Let us consider what connection between phraseological units and the mentality of the people is, what characteristic features of Russian culture are reflected in the Russian national character.

Ethnic stereotypes serve as a measurable manifestation of a national character. They serve an important function in determining human behavior in different situations. Ethnic stereotypes are a generalized idea of the typical traits that characterize any people. For example, our idea of the Chinese culture, which is distinguished by many subtleties and excesses in observing customs and traditions, is reflected in the *китайские церемонии* (excessive conventions in relations between people). It should be noted that in Russian this set phrase is often used as ironic. The reason is the clash of two cultures that are completely different from each other. We see a lot of unusual and strange in the Chinese culture, which makes us laugh or irony.

Phraseological units reflecting a positive or negative assessment of certain human qualities can be considered an indicator of ethical standards, the rules of social life and behavior in society, as well as the relationship of a nation through its culture and language to the world. Researchers note that the most important positive qualities of Russian people are kindness, sensitivity, selflessness, generosity, sociability. This feature is confirmed by the presence among the phraseologemes of the studied group of such units as *большое сердце, доброе сердце, рубаха-парень, широкая натура, артельный парень, палочка-выручалочка, душа*

нараспаику, душа человек, etc. It is interesting that the discovered virtues advantages of the Russian character were not understood as qualities that compensate for its shortcomings, but as a continuation of these shortcomings. When it comes to the Russian national character, then immediately there is an idea of the mysterious Russian soul, about which foreigners often speak with admiration or with mockery. According to S.G. Ter-Minasova, everything lies in the fact that the Russian person in the national system of values has the fundamental concept that prevails over reason, mind, common sense – the “soul”, whereas, for example, the core concept for Englishmen is reason, common sense – mind, and lexical unit for “soul” as a part of phraseological units corresponds to the English word “heart” [13, p. 166–167]. Among the phrasemes given by the author, phraseological units which have no matches in the word system. For example: *всеми силами души* – with all one’s heart, *душа нараспаику* – smb. is open-hearted, *до глубины души* – to the bottom of one’s heart, *камень на душе* – smb’s heart is heavy with sorrow, guilt, *в глубине души* – in one’s heart of hearts.

Let us turn to the analysis of the manifestation of other cultural factors in the meaning of the set phrases of the investigated group.

We should pay attention to the fact that the semantics of the group under study reflects more shortcomings than advantages. In our opinion, the reason is that negative qualities attract more attention, while positive ones are considered normal and do not cause much interest in a person. This is probably why such a large amount of phrasemes is allocated with a negative estimate. Let’s take a group as an example with the phrase “A person is perceived by others”, which is divided into two subgroups: positive perception by other people (36) and negative perception by other people (74). It should be noted that the subgroup “Negative perception by other people” can be further divided into many microgroups due to the variety of negative perceptions: the highest degree of manifestation of negative (*исчадие ада*), lack of significance for others (*ноль без палочки, пустое место, отставной козы барабаник*), absence of certainty (*ни пава, ни ворона, ни богу свечка, ни чёрту кочерга, ни рыба, ни мясо*), exaggeration of his/her significance (*дутый пузырь, мыльный пузырь, ворона в павлиньих перьях*), fragility of manifestation of something (*рыцарь на час, калиф на час*), distrust (*Фома неверный*), isolation, passivity (*человек в футляре*), finicky (*принцесса на горошине*), secrecy (*тёмная лошадка*), etc. The fact that phraseological units with a negative rating far exceed the number of units with a positive assessment does not seem strange, because the presence of a large number of shortcomings in a person accordingly causes a reaction among other people, which is fixed in the language.

Phrasemes that do not have correspondences in the word system also characterize the most common negative qualities of a person in the Russian national character, such as frivolity (*ветер в голове, ветряная мельница, ветреная головушка, буйная головушка, подбитый ветром, забубённая голова, саврас без узды*, etc.); lack of thinking (*голова еловая, баранья голова, задним умом крепко, глуп как пробка, ни в зуб ногой*, etc.); shyness, hesitation (*буриданов осёл, красная девица, тише воды, ниже травы*, etc.); irresponsibility, namely: reluctance to intervene in anything (*моя хата с краю, моё дело сторона*), unwillingness to go beyond a narrow circle of duties (*наше дело маленькое*), frequent change of decisions (*семь пятниц на неделе*, etc.).

It should be noted that, for example, in English, the listed qualities are either not represented at all, or presented, but in very

small quantities. According to scientists/scholars, English idiomatics is dominated by such value concepts as honesty, responsibility, restraint, hard work, professionalism [9; 13].

Ethnic stereotypes can not only influence a person’s sympathy or antipathy in a situation of intercultural contacts, but also determine his/her behavior in various situations.

Throughout their lives, people are part of certain sociocultural groups. Each such group has its own microculture (subculture), which is based on the religious, geographical, racial, age, language, family, as well as gender of its members. Depending on this kind of affiliation, each subculture adheres to a certain model of behavior. In connection with this feature, the stereotype of behavior is one of the most important among stereotypes.

If we consider language in the aspect of genderology, then we should distinguish between female and male linguistic personalities, female and male types and characteristics of behavior. Regarding what is considered “masculine” and what is “feminine”, there are different opinions in each culture. For example, in cultures dominated by the patriarchal attitude, work, strength, independence, material success, competition, and the separation of male and female roles occupy a central place in the worldview of the linguistic personality. In cultures with a matriarchal attitude, these characteristics are considered to be less important. The man himself and the meaning of his/her existence, emotional connections among people, caring for other members of society are emphasized. In Russian culture there is a patriarchal setting, which is reflected in the language. In its composition, stereotypes are firmly entrenched, according to which a woman has many vices, so a comparison with her man always carries a negative connotation. Let us take, for example, the phraseological units of the investigated group: *базарная баба, женский характер, женская логика, девичья память, женский ум, переезжая сваха*, etc. A comparison with a man only adorns a woman: *мужской ум, мужской характер, мужская хватка*.

These features are based on stereotypes of behavior that are enshrined in society: for men – firmness, determination, rivalry, desire to be the first; for women – gentleness, emotionality, sensuality, patience. Therefore, in general, a woman’s speech is much more emotional, which is expressed in the more frequent use of idiomatic expressions, comparisons, metaphors, epithets. In the woman’s lexicon there are more words and stable combinations describing feelings, emotions, psychophysical states, while the male type of communication is a less flexible, but more dynamic communication [9, p. 126–129].

Intercultural communication involves not only an analysis of the factors that form the semantics of phraseological units, the study of the features of the linguistic picture of the world, but also an analysis of the features of the functioning of phrases, or rather, the restriction on their use, due to cultural factors.

We draw attention to the fact that even a complete awareness of the mores and customs of one culture does not give a representative of other culture full information about the linguistic picture of the first world. To do this, you must be a native speaker of this language. Consider, for example, phrasemes *глухая тетеря* and *слепая курица*. These phrasemes in the dictionary have the meanings of “a person who does not hear well”, “shortsighted, poorly seeing people” which carry no information that the given phrasemes have any limitations in use. Such information is determined by the lexical units of “тетеря” and “курица”, which in Russian have a pronounced negative coloring. Let us pay attention to the fact that

глухая тетеря and *слепая курица* become a marker of the cultural connotation of phrasemes, which is a litter “unapproved”, which serves as a kind of signal for a carrier of another culture that these phrases should not be used in relation to old people.

Thus, the factors that determine semantics and limit the use of a phrase can interact with each other, providing cultural information about the norms of use of a particular turnover.

The national-cultural specificity of phrasemes is determined not only by stereotypicality, but also by the symbolism of their figurative foundation. A symbol in culture is “a universal category with the help of which people can express and convey all their internal states” [7, p. 110]. They are conventional signs denoting some objects, phenomena or processes. Their main feature is “the ability” to replace “real objects or phenomena and express the information contained therein” [7, p. 111]. Any culture creates its own system of symbols and gives each symbol the corresponding meanings. Of particular interest is the symbolism of color designations, and as its particular manifestation is the use of color naming as part of the phrasemes.

In this case, consider this problem on the example of phraseological units that do not have correspondences in the word system. In Russian, blue and pink are symbols of tenderness, romance, and dreams. This symbolism influenced the emergence of such phraseological units as *розовые мечты*, *в розовых красках*, *голубые мечты*. Red color symbolizes fire, intense heat, that is, that which can severely burn (*красное словцо*). The metaphorical meaning of white and black is the same in many languages. In Russian, black color, as a rule, is a symbol of the embodiment of evil, dark forces, death, grief, mourning, and white – a symbol of good, love, and purity. This is confirmed by the presence among the turnovers of the studied group of such phraseological units as black *чёрный день*, *чёрный ворон*, *чёрная магия*, *чёрная зависть*, *чёрный список*, as well as *белая магия*, *белая зависть*, etc.

It is necessary to pay attention to numerical symbolism, which in each culture has its own functions. As an example of symbolic contradistinction, we can cite phrases of the Russian language, where the measurement symbol is the number “seven”, and English, with the symbolic component nine (“nine”): (*быть*) *на седьмом небе* – (to be) on cloud nine (literally be on the ninth cloud). In Russian, the number “seven” is also distinguished as a part of such phraseological units that do not have correspondences in the system of words, such as *семи пядей во лбу*, *семь пятниц на неделе*, *седьмая вода на киселе*, *книга за семью печатями*, and the number “nine” in English in the phraseological unit of the studied group *a nine day's wonder* (literally the miracle of nine days) – “something perceived to be very attractive in a certain period of time, but subsequently very quickly forgotten”. The role of the number “nine” in English phraseology is explained by the meaning of this concept in ancient German culture. The figure “nine” plays a large role in German mythology, in the legal system, the week totaled nine days, the distance of nine steps was used as a measure of length [8, p. 46–47]. Note that in Japanese idioms, the number “eight” appears in a similar function.

Note that in addition to colorant and numerical symbols, Russian idioms stand out for phraseological units with zoological characters: *глуп как баран* (a ram is a symbol of stupidity), *Лиса Патрикеевна* (a fox is a symbol of cunning, resourcefulness), *змея подколодная* (a snake is a symbol of treachery), *здоров как бык* (bull is a symbol of health), *медвежья услуга* (bear is a symbol of clumsiness, awkwardness), etc.; symbols-substances: *кровь с молоком*, *кровный*

враг, *кровная обида* (blood – a symbol of health, kinship), *подводные камни* (stone – a symbol of difficulties, obstacles), *тяжёлый хлеб*, *лёгкий хлеб* (bread – a symbol of prosperity, welfare), *голова еловая*, *голова садовая*, *светлая голова* (head is a symbol of mind, reason), *правая рука*, *мастер на все руки*, *золотые руки* (hand is a symbol of help, as well as performance), etc.; symbols of perception: *не жизнь, а малина* (raspberries are a symbol of good life), *медовый месяц* (something sweet, pleasant is always associated with honey, for example, the happiest time of married life).

As you can see, as a part of the phrase of the group under study, the key role in the meaning and in the implementation of the peripheral part of the value is played by zoological symbols, color symbols, symbols-substances, symbols-perceptions, as well as numerical symbols.

Due to the presence of components with symbolic meaning, the semantics of the analyzed phraseological units becomes much more accessible and understandable to the native speaker, but often creates difficulties in intercultural communication, since in the culture of other people many symbols have different associative connections. Consider, as an example, the phrase of the studied group, which associative connections are zoo-characters in different languages. So, in the English idiom, the symbol of awkwardness is *an elephant* (слон в посудной лавке), and in Russian – a *bear* (медвежий обаяние); the health symbol in English connotes the word *horse* (as strong as a horse – здоров как лошадь) in Russian – a *bull* (здоров как бык). In the Russian mentality *a dog*, in addition to negative signs (собачья жизнь, собачьи условия), can associate positive (собачья верность, собачья преданность). In the Belarusian language, the indicated word in most cases carries negative connotations (сабакам падшыты – “плохой человек”). In the Vietnamese worldview, *the pig* is a symbol of stupidity, and in the Russian – a *ram* (глуп как баран, баранья голова).

As you can see, phrasemes with no direct equivalents really occupy a significant role in the cultural representation of a Russian person, since they do not only characterize a person, his activity, mental abilities, spiritual qualities, etc., but also have specific features, which reflects the symbolism of the people.

Conclusion. The presented observations allow us to draw the following conclusions:

1. Phraseological units with no direct equivalents play a special role in reflecting the national stereotype, worldview and mentality, which must be taken into account in the process of intercultural communication.

2. In phraseological units with no direct equivalents cultural information is realized through the interaction of factors that determine semantics and limit the use of the phrase of the analyzed group.

3. The national-cultural specificity of the phraseological units of the studied group is determined by the symbolism of their figurative foundation. As part of phrases that do not have correspondences in the system of words, the main role in the formation of meaning is played by zoological symbols, color symbols, substantive symbols, perception symbols, and numerical symbols. Due to the presence of components with symbolic meaning, the semantics of the analyzed phraseological units becomes much more accessible and understandable to the native speaker and creates difficulties in intercultural communication.

Further studies of the phrasemes with no direct equivalents will be devoted to examining the question of how their communicative features are reflected in dictionaries.

References:

1. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1999. 896 с.
2. Бромлей Ю.В. Этнос и этнография. Москва : Наука, 1973. 285 с.
3. Верещагин Е.М., Костомаров В.Г. Язык и культура: Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного. Москва : Русский язык, 1990. 246 с.
4. Воробьев В.В. О статусе лингвокультурологии. *IX Международный Конгресс МАПРЯЛ. Русский язык, литература и культура на рубеже веков*. Т. 2. Братислава, 1999. С. 124–128.
5. Галочкина Е.А. «Пусть меня научат.» Межкультурная коммуникация в учебной аудитории. *Россия и Запад: диалог культур*. Вып. 5. Москва, 1998. С. 217–223.
6. Головановская М.К. Французский менталитет с точки зрения носителя русского языка. Москва : МГУ, 1997. 278 с.
7. Грушевицкая Т.Г., Попков В.Д., Садохин А.П. Основы межкультурной коммуникации. Москва : ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2003. 352 с.
8. Добровольский Д.О. Национально-культурная специфика во фразеологии. *Вопросы языкознания*. № 6. 1997. С. 37–48.
9. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология. Москва : Издательский центр «Академия», 2001. 208 с.
10. Степанов Ю. С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 1997. 825 с.
11. Стернин И.А. Коммуникативное поведение в структуре национальной культуры. *Этнокультурная специфика языкового сознания*. Москва, 1996. С. 97–112.
12. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты. Москва : Школа «Языки русской культуры», 1996. 288 с.
13. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и международная коммуникация. Москва : «Слово», 2000. 261 с.
14. Bennett M. Basic Concepts of Intercultural Communication. Selected Readings. Yarmouth, 1998. 272 p.
15. Gudykunst W. Intercultural Communication Theory. Current Perspectives. Newbury Park, 1983. 298 p.
16. Martin J., Nakayama Th. Intercultural Communication in Contexts. London. Toronto. 2000. 364 p.
17. Paige R. M. Education for the Intercultural Experience. Yarmouth, 1993. 351 p.
18. Trager G., Hall E. Culture and Communication: A Model and an Analysis. *Explorations and Communication*. №3, 1954. P. 157–249.

Місеньова В., Спільник Т. Безеквівалентні фразеологічні одиниці в аспекті міжкультурної комунікації

Анотація. У статті систематизовано теоретичну інформацію дослідження міжкультурної комунікації та здійснено

аналіз таких її напрямів, як порівняльна культурологія, теорія перекладу, навчання іноземних мов, контрастивна прагматика і т. ін.

У процесі дослідження автори вивчає низку питань, а саме: у чому виражається національний характер та що можна вважати джерелом, яке надавало б справжні відомості про національний характер. Особливості особистості відображаються в її мові загалом та у використанні фразеологічних зворотів зокрема. Фразеологічні одиниці, відбиваючи у своїй семантиці тривалий процес розвитку культури народу, фіксують та передають із покоління в покоління культурні концепти, стереотипи, символи, еталони, міфологеми тощо.

Автори аналізують зв'язок фразеологічних одиниць із менталітетом народу, вивчають, які характерні риси культури знаходять своє відображення в національному характері.

Виявлено, що останнім часом лінгвісти дедалі більше зосереджують увагу на вивченні перекладу як культурному явищі. Різні мови здатні відбивати специфічні особливості культури. Однак не всі елементи фонду одного мовного колективу можуть мати місце в культурному фонді іншого. У процесі перекладу ця особливість ускладнює передавання культурної специфіки однієї мови засобами іншої.

Попри те, що деякі фрагменти дійсності в різних мовах збігаються, способи їх номінації можуть суттєво відрізнятися. Наприклад, у російській та англійській мовах є група одиниць, що позначають їжу та напої. Однак спосіб номінації в англійській мові відрізняється вживанням одиниць зі словом *tea* (*чай*), які відсутні в російській мові: *high tea* (*ранній ужин с чаем*), *husband's tea* (*очень слабый чай*), *a cup that cheers but not inebriates* (*напиток веселящий, но не пьянящий*). Названа особливість зумовлена своєрідністю культури й побуту англійців, які відрізняються від інших націй своєю любов'ю до чаювання.

Важливим є той факт, що знання правил поведінки та звичаїв однієї культури не дають представникові іншої культури повної інформації про її мовну картину.

Запропоновані спостереження дозволяють виділити такі аспекти дослідження міжкультурної комунікації, як макрокультура – переклад – ступінь еквівалентності, облік національно-культурних факторів.

Ключові слова: безеквівалентні фраземи, еквівалентність, зіставний аналіз, національно-культурний компонент, семантика, символ.